UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,720	12/29/2003	Ramon M. Velez JR.	1235_001	5879

20874 7590 06/15/2007

MARJAMA & BILINSKI LLP
250 SOUTH CLINTON STREET
SUITE 300
SYRACUSE, NY 13202

EXAMINER	
EL ARINI, ZEINAB	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1746	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER
	20070514

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Status of Amendments After Final
The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

Zeinab Elarini
Zeinab E. EL-Arini
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1746

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/747,720
Filing Date: December 29, 2003
Appellant(s): VELEZ, RAMON M.

Dana F. Bigelow
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/11/2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/11/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

5,679,174	Buongiorno	10-1997
1,492,905	Swanick	5-1924
5,464,479	Kenton et al.	11-1995

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buongiorno (5,679,174) in combination with Swanick (1,492,9050 or Kenton et al. (5,464,479).

Buongiorno discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal passageways of an airfoil (turbine blade) by inserting a tube into the internal passageway. See col. 1, lines 64-67, col. 2, lines 1-10, and 25-61, col. 3, line 1- col. 4, line 5, and the claims. The

reference discloses all limitations with the exception of installing a plurality of parts into a holder, providing a guide member, and providing a manifold as claimed.

Swanick discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning internal surface of a component by inserting a tube inside the component and dispensing a cleaning fluid into the internal surfaces. The apparatus has a plurality of nozzles, which are connected to common manifold 3. See Figs. 1-2, page 1, line 69- page 2, line 10, and the claims. The reference discloses the installing step, the manifold, and the guide member as claimed.

Kenton et al. disclose a method for removing undesired material from internal spaces of parts (blades). The reference discloses installing a plurality of parts into a fixture, which is mounted in the flushing cabinet. The high-pressure flush system comprises a cabinet, a central pump, a water source, and plurality of hoses. The attachment hoses extend from the shuttle valve through cabinet wall fittings and connect to disconnect provided on the part holding fixture. The fixture, in turn, is designated to direct water from the hoses into the internal spaces of the blade. See col. 8, line 50- col. 9, line 30, and Fig. 3.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time applicant invented the claimed process to utilize different lengths of dispensing means for the

purpose of using the process for different lengths of components. One would have been motivated to change the length of the tubes so that can fit different lengths of components or tubes and clean the internal surface.

(10) Response to Argument

1. Appellant's argument with respect to Swanick is unpersuasive, because wash out the contents, flushing the internal surface and emptying the contents from the surface are all equivalent.

2. In response to appellant's argument that Swanick does not provide a guide member, appellant argues is unpersuasive. See the guide member 2 in Fig. 1.

3. Appellant's argument with respect to Buongiorno in combination with Swanick and Kenton et al. is unpersuasive. This is because it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the multiple dispensing means taught by Swanick or Kenton et al. in the Buongiorno process for the purpose of treating multiple components simultaneously to reduce the treatment time and to increase the process efficiency. The references fail to disclose probes are of different length. One skilled in the art would choose the length of the probes depend on the depth of the cavities. See Buongiorno, Figs. 3 and 4. Using hoses in Kenton et al. will be able to perform the same function of using the probes as claimed.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Zeinab EL-Arini Zeinab Elarini

Conferees:

Michael Barr

MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Jennifer K[redacted]-Michener

JENNIFER MICHENER
QUALITY ASSURANCE SPECIALIST